REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants again request acknowledgement and consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 13, 2006. A copy of submitted form PTO-1449 for the examiner's convenience.

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirai (JP 2003-002015) and Feijen et al. (USPN 5, 092,381). Claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter previously recited in claim 4, rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, applicants address the examiner's rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Hirai, Feijen and Nishizawa (USPN 4,836,262). Applicants traverse this rejection because the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest cord-to-cord distances from a belt reinforcement layer to a belt layer and from the belt reinforcement layer to a carcass layer that are each between 0.5 mm and 1.5 mm, as now recited in claim 1.

Hirai discloses a tire including a belt layer disposed on a radially outer peripheral part of a carcass layer, and a reinforcing layer made up of cords extending substantially in the tire circumferential direction disposed radially outward of the belt layer. Additionally, the examiner cites Feijen to disclose the use of polyethylene terephthalate (PET) yarn having a load between 4.5N and 150N at 5% elongation. However, as acknowledged by the examiner on page 5 of the outstanding office action, neither Hirai nor Feijen discloses cord-to-cord distance between reinforcing elements in the layers of the tire. Instead, the examiner relies on Nishizawa to disclose this feature.

Nishizawa teaches that the shortest vertical distance L between the most adjacent metal filaments in opposed metal cord between adjoining metal cord layers is within a range of 0.5 mm to 1.3 mm. However, the vertical distance L disclosed in Nishizawa is different from the cord-to-cord distance recited in claim 1 of the present application. Firstly, the distance L disclosed by Nishizawa is not a true cord-to-cord distance. Instead, the distance L merely measures vertical displacement between cords. That is, the measurement fails to account for any horizontal displacement between adjacent cords. Thus, it is impossible to determine an actual cord-to-cord distance between most adjacent cords in Nishizawa based only on the distance L.

Secondly, the vertical distance L disclosed by Nishizawa is the distance between metal filaments in adjoining metal cord layers. That is, the reference discloses measuring the vertical distance between metal filaments in two adjacent belt layers, and not cord-to-cord distance between a belt reinforcement layer and a belt layer or between a belt reinforcement layer and a carcass layer. Additionally, Nishizawa only teaches that the vertical distance between filaments in adjacent layers is within the range of 0.5 mm and 1.3 mm. At least the belt reinforcement layer and the carcass layer as recited in claim 1 are not adjacent layers.

Claim 1 of the present application recites that the cord-to-cord distances from the belt reinforcement layer to the belt layer and from the belt reinforcement layer to the carcass layer are set between 0.5 mm and 1.5 mm. Maintaining a relatively small cord-to-cord distance advantageously helps to reduce road noise generated by the tire. However,

when cord-to-cord distances are distances are reduced to less than 0.5 mm, the cords may be in contact with one anther after vulcanization, which reduces high speed durability of the tire. Moreover, when the cord-to-cord distances are larger than 1.5 mm, the tires become less effective at reducing road noise. Since Hirai, Feijen, and Nishizawa, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest this feature, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 5 be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirai and Feijen in view of Poque (DE 4209817). Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and thus includes all the features of claim 1, plus additional features. Accordingly, applicants request the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn in light of the above arguments directed to claim 1, and because Poque fails to remedy the deficiencies identified with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

For all of the above reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

If a Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response is

required to make the attached response timely, it is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R.

§1.136(a) for an extension of time for response in the above-identified application for the

period required to make the attached response timely. The Commissioner is hereby

authorized to charge fees which may be required to this application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-

1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-2069.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

Kevin T. Bastuba

Registration No. 59,905

May 8, 2009

300 South Wacker Drive

Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606 Telephone: 312.360.0080 Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978

7

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are req

PTC/SB/08a/b (07-05)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

	Complete if Known		
Application Number	Not Yet Assigned		
Filing Date	Concurrently Herewith		
First Named Inventor	Masatoshi Kuwajima		
Art Unit	N/A		
Examiner Name	Not Yet Assigned		
Attorney Docket Number	OGW-0418		
	Filing Date First Named Inventor Art Unit Examiner Name		

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
Examiner Initials*	Cite No.1	Document Number Number-Kind Code ² (if known)	Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY	Name of Patentee or Applicant of Cited Document	Pages, Columns, Lines, Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear	

		FOREI	GN PATENT	DOCUMENTS		_
	Cite	Foreign Patent Document	Publication Date MM-DD-YYYY	Neme of Patentee or	Pages, Columns, Lines,	Т
	No.1	Country Code ³ -Number ⁴ -Kind Code ⁸ (if known)			Where Relevant Passages or Relevant Figures Appear	T ⁶
	BA		07-03-2001	The Yokohama Rubber Co., Ltd.		7
	BB	JP-2001-063312-A	03-13-2001	BRIDGESTONE CORP	 	-
	BC	JP-06-247105-A		BRIDGESTONE CORP		17
	BD	JP-2002-046411-A		BRIDGESTONE CORP		1
	BE			BRIDGESTONE CORP		7
	BF		05-13-1992	TOYO TIRE & RUBBER CO		7

"EXAMINER, Initial if inference considered, whether or and caster is in conformance with MPEP 600. Draw line through classon if not in conformance and not considered, include copy of the form which experience produces." Applicant a victime classification number (optional). "See Kinst Codes of USPTO Pastert Documents a <u>Invalvation are</u> or WIPEP 601.0." Experience plant included and a <u>Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalvation are an Invalvation are an Invalvation are an Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalvation are an Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalvation and Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalvation and Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalvation and Invalvation and Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalvation and Invalvation are an Invalvation and Invalva</u>

		NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS	
Examiner Initials	Cite No.1	Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published.	T
	CA	International Search Report, November 16, 2004	+

*EXAMINER: initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

'Applicant's unique citation designation number (optional). *Applicant is to place a check mark here if English language Translation is attached.

Examiner		
	Date	
Signature	Considered	